

any serious constitutional objections; but others, on grounds of expediency, seem to have been made from some quarter, which the President, in his next annual message proceeds to discuss in detail, and to remove. It is somewhat remarkable that the four objections which are noticed by the President and answered, have since been among the most prominent ones made to the land bill. The objections which are formally stated in the Message, and each answered separately and at length, are these: 1. To the ratio of distribution; 2. To its tendency to produce increased taxation; 3. That the States would improvidently use the fund; and, lastly, that it would create an improper dependence of the States on the General Government. Sir, the argument of the President is so clear on these points, and so entirely conclusive, that were it not for its great length, I would ask permission of the committee for the Clerk to read it.—But the time which I have prescribed for myself to occupy the attention of the committee is already so far spent, that I must omit it. I commend it to the attention of all—to those who may doubt upon the points it discusses, as containing matter calculated to remove their doubts, and to those who continue making the objections, as presenting arguments which they will do well to consider how they are to answer to their own judgments, and to their constituents. You well know, sir, that this measure of distribution was once, whatever it may be now, a favorite with your own State; that in 1827 it received the strong recommendation of Governor Clinton in his message; that it was also recommended by Governor Throop in 1831, and that, at the same session of your Legislature, a resolution approving it, passed your House of Assembly by a unanimous vote; but as the particular attention of the committee has already been called to these propositions from New York, by other gentlemen, I will not dwell on them.

You will notice, sir, that all the propositions which I have just mentioned, contemplated a distribution of the revenue without reference to the sources from which it was obtained; and included the proceeds of the public lands, as well as the revenue derived from the customs.—But the proceeds of the public lands have always been looked upon as standing upon a different footing from the revenue derived from other sources. I have not extended my researches very far back, but I find that, in February, 1826, the standing committee of this House on the Public Lands, by Mr Strong, one of its members from New York, made a report to the House recommending an annual appropriation of a portion of the net proceeds of the public lands for the support of schools, and of apportioning the same among the States in proportion to their representation. In February, 1829, a resolution was adopted by the House, on motion of Mr Stevenson, of Pennsylvania, a political friend of the present President, raising a committee to inquire into the expediency of distributing annually all the money arising from the sales of the public lands among the several States, in the same proportion.—This reference, also, produced a report favorable to the measure. On the 17th of December, 1829, my predecessor in this House (Gen Hunt), introduced a resolution directing "the Committee on Public Lands to inquire into the expediency of appropriating the net annual proceeds of the sales of the public lands among the several States, for the purposes of education and internal improvement, in proportion to the representation of each in the House of Representatives." This resolution was discussed from day to day, during the morning hour, until the 19th of January, when it was adopted with some modifications, and, among others, with one changing the committee from that of the public lands to a select one. Mr Hunt, as chairman of the committee, at the same session made a report, which will be found among our printed documents, giving a succinct and lucid history of the public lands, examining with candor and skill the nature and character of the power of this Government over them, and concluding with the report of a bill in favor of the distribution of their proceeds. I am sure, sir, every individual now present, who was a member of this House at the period during which Mr Hunt held a seat on this floor—a seat vacated by his lamented death in this city—will bear witness to the talent and assiduity with which he performed all his duties here, as well as to the high minded and honorable motives which governed him; and it is no disparagement to any of the eminent statesmen who have since discussed the subject of the public lands, to say, he clearly foresaw the future importance of this growing resource of the public revenue; that his report contains the germ of nearly every argument which has since been urged in favor of the constitutionality and expediency of distribution; and that it has been seldom, if ever surpassed in ability.

You will perceive, sir, that this measure is not new to this House or to the country, and that long before Mr Clay first introduced his bill into the Senate, my own constituents, in particular, had, through their Representative, urged upon Congress, with earnestness and skill, the justice and propriety of the measure; and that, in now standing up as its advocate, I am not following in the lead of party, but am only expressing, as well as I am able, the long-cherished and declared will of my district. Sir, I repeat what I have before said, this measure of distribution cannot, with any propriety, be called a party measure. No particular man, no particular party, can, with any justice, claim the honor of its paternity. It is not a measure, like many other schemes of squandering the public money, which the disensed political atmosphere of this capital has lately generated, that requires deep thought and laborious research to originate. It is the natural, spontaneous production of the minds of the great mass of the People themselves. Proceeding on the self-evident proposition, so well expressed by General Jackson in his message of 1830, that "the resources of the nation, beyond those required for the immediate and necessary purposes of the Government, can no where be so well deposited as in the pockets of the People," the People look down upon their representatives, and say to them—"Gentlemen, you have got a large amount of our money which you can't profitably use—please give it back to us." The idea is perfectly simple and natural; and it would be doing manifest injustice to the common under-

standing of every man in the nation to go about hunting among the giant minds of our statesmen to discover its origin.

Mr Chairman, I shall not trespass on the patience of the committee by repeating the arguments which have been so well and so conclusively stated by others, to show the constitutionality and propriety of a distribution of the proceeds of the public lands. It has been shown to this committee, by gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate, and particularly by the gentlemen from Virginia (Mr McComas) and Kentucky, (Mr Underwood), that this distribution is not only in conformity with the Constitution, but is, so far as the important cession of Virginia is concerned, imposed upon Congress as a duty by the very language and spirit of the deed of cession. And I confess I am unable to see how this Government can otherwise honestly discharge the trust reposed in it by that act of cession, than by giving to Virginia and each of the other States their respective shares of the common fund. Sir, I have not heard the constitutionality of this measure seriously questioned. Any objection of that kind, it seems to me, would now come altogether too late. It has hitherto been supposed that the power of this Government over the public lands and their proceeds was unaffected by the limitations imposed in the Constitution on the use of money raised for revenue purposes. I have looked into the various elementary writers on the Constitution, and I find they all concur in giving to that article of the Constitution which confers the power on Congress "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States," a construction which would leave the proceeds wholly unrestrained to the purposes for which taxes and imposts may be imposed. It is an article separate from, and wholly independent of, that conferring the taxing power, and cannot be circumscribed by its limitations. From the very commencement of the Government, we have been in the constant habit of legislating on this construction, and the constitutionality of such legislation, so far as I am informed, has never remained unquestioned. We have made grants of the public lands to States, to corporations, and individuals, for almost all conceivable purposes—for purposes to which no one would have thought of appropriating the general revenue. We have appropriated over eight millions of acres for common schools, more than two millions for internal improvements, and about five hundred thousand acres for colleges and academies, ninety thousand acres for religious and charitable institutions; and in the acts of admission into the Union of each of the seven new States, five per cent. on the amount of the sales of the public lands within their respective limits, is granted by Congress, either for the purposes of internal improvement or education. And are we now to be met with an argument against the power of Congress to make this distribution? I trust not. Sir, if any constitutional question can be considered as settled by a long, uniform and uninterrupted course of practical legislation, the general power over the lands is one of them?

I have been amused, sir, at the variety and contradictory character of the objections which are made to the distribution as proposed by the land bill on your table. The readiness to contradiction in the arguments which are adduced against this measure is so great, that you seldom hear an objection raised by one gentleman, but the next one you listen to astounds you with one of directly and opposite character; and you rarely meet with a single speech or public document against this distribution, in which a prominent position assumed in one paragraph is not contradicted and overturned in that contained in a succeeding one? I am persuaded, sir, that no more effectual way of overthrowing all these arguments could be devised, than by collecting them all together and placing them in juxtaposition with each other. I think their mere contact would be their sufficient refutation. I will not detain the committee by noticing all the extraordinary objections which the ingenuity of gentlemen has devised against this measure of distribution, but I must beg leave to notice a few of the most prominent of them.

Sir, one person objects against this bill because it is temporary, it is limited in its operation; it only proposes a distribution for five years, and is therefore, no final settlement of the question in regard to the public lands. I believe this is one of the objections in the Veto Message to the bill which passed the two Houses in '33. Another objection now made is, that the measure will be a permanent one. It is said if the distribution is once made, if the States and people but once get a taste of this treasure, they never will give it up. And this last argument, so complimentary to the wisdom and intelligence of the people, is one which is urged with considerable earnestness; and I do not know but the time may soon come, if it has not already arrived, when implicit faith in it will be required as one of the qualifications for membership in what gentlemen are pleased to denominate the "Democratic Party." I confess my democracy is not of that character. I have entire confidence in the ultimate decision of the People. If the distribution works well, and the revenue of the country will admit it, it will be continued; otherwise, it will be abandoned.

Sir, another objection made against this bill is, that by placing the States in a dependent position on the General Government, it will tend to produce consolidation. This, I think, is also one of the Veto objections. This objection is not only overturned by the argument contained in the President's Message in 1830, but is contradicted by a new argument which has lately come into fashion. The argument is this: that the States, by abstracting the funds from the National treasury, will become all-powerful, and leave the General Government too weak to carry on its necessary operations. I confess, sir, that this argument, coming, as it does, from gentlemen claiming to have in their peculiar keeping the principles of the old Republican party, strikes my ears rather gratefully. But this is a day of new things, and I suppose we must brace up our nerves to stand the shock of any thing, however strange or unexpected. I thought that if there was any one principle which stood out above all others as the platform on which the old Republican party was founded, it was, that the danger to our system arose from the

weakness of the States, and the too great and absorbing power of the General Government; but now, forsooth, we are exhorted, in the holy names of Republicanism and Democracy, not to distribute to the States, a surplus revenue which the General Government does not need, and cannot use, for fear of enlarging the system, by strengthening the power of the States! Sir, this objection, like the other, taxes my democracy too heavily. I can't go it.

Mr Chairman, an objection has been raised against the bill on your table, because it proposes to give the new States some ten per cent. on the amount of the sales of the lands within their respective limits, for the purposes of internal improvement, before the general distribution is made; and, for this reason, it is said, the distribution is unequal and unjust to the old States. Sir, this objection is not only answered by the uniform practice of the Government, which I have before stated, to make, as a means of enhancing the value and increasing the sales of the residue of the lands, grants of lands for such purposes; but by the fact that the additional ten per cent may be deemed necessary to place the new States on an equality with the old, for the reason that the former have increased with much more rapidity in population, since the last census, than the latter; of which increase in the new States the amount of their respective land sales is the best priced measurement. But the objection is contradicted and overturned by another, still more extraordinary. Sir, in a public document, where I find this objection most strongly urged, and most laboriously insisted on, the final views of the author are summed up in the following language—"I do not doubt that it is the real interest of each and all the States in the Union, and particularly of the new States, that the price of these lands shall be reduced and graduated; and that after they have been offered for a certain number of years, the residue, remaining unsold, shall be abandoned to the States." Yes, sir, we are told that it is unconstitutional, a violation of compact, and unjust to the old States, to allow the new States, in a measure of general distribution, a small per centage on the amount of the sales; and yet, that, after a few thousand acres more are sold, it will be perfectly constitutional, in clear conformity with compact, and perfectly just to the old States, to cede the whole of the lands to the new. Sir, was there ever any public measure which met with such unaccountable, such extraordinary—is it too much to say, absurd—objections? And what, sir, is the object of this war upon reason and common sense? Why, sir, no other, than I can discover, than to enable the persons who are carrying on the war to reap a rich harvest of patronage, by controlling and directing the use of the money, whose distribution they oppose. And this brings me to the consideration of another objection which has been made, and the last one which I shall notice. It is said that we have no security that the States will make a wise use of this money. I will ask, sir, what security have the people that we shall make a wise use of it? Have they not the strongest possible reasons to believe that, if it remains undistributed, we shall use it wastefully and improvidently. If they are not already sensible of it, they have read but poorly the signs of the times,—have watched but carelessly the movements of their representatives.—Sir, I will not at this time go into this subject more fully than I have already done. But I would ask if there is a man here who seriously and truly believes that the States could not and would not make a much better use of this money than we should? It is notorious that the States use their funds much more economically than we do—that any State can accomplish a given object with half the amount of money that we can. Their agents are nearer to the People, and feel a much deeper and stronger responsibility. The people themselves take a deeper interest in the objects of a State character than in those of the General Government, and watch the agents more closely. And what is this objection, after all, but an insult to the understandings and integrity of the people? Gentlemen talk here as if they supposed all the virtue and all the wisdom of the nation were congregated in these Halls, and that nothing could be well done unless we do it.

Sir, I have no such belief. I believe that Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania—say, and Vermont too—and every other State in the Union, would appropriate their respective shares in this fund to much better purposes than we should. And, sir, I have no fears of its corrupting the States. It is when money is collected in large masses, where it cannot be properly used, that the danger of corruption exists. That is the precise situation of the surplus revenue in reference to the General Government. We have no proper objects to which we can apply it, and therefore we must expect that it will naturally be used for improper and corrupt purposes. The condition of the States is wholly different. The great objects of internal improvement and education, which come within the peculiar province of State legislation, will furnish ample and highly beneficial uses for the application of the proceeds of the public lands for years to come; and so long as those objects require the fostering care of the State authorities, there is no possible danger that the fund will corrupt them. Appropriated under the wise legislation of the People's immediate Representatives, it will infuse new life and vigor into the business of the whole country, and its usefulness be benignly felt and appreciated by every man in the Union.

Mr Chairman, I have said this measure of the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands was a measure of the people. It has received the long recorded approbation of the most eminent and valued men of all political parties; it cannot be resisted by any argument which addresses itself to the good sense and sound reason of men; and the powerful evidences of its healthful character are within the easy comprehension of the most common understanding. Do you suppose the great body of the people, especially those in the interior of the country, will be satisfied to have the surplus money in the Treasury foolishly squandered on the seaboard; or that they will be content to have it remain in the custody of some thirty or forty banking corporations, for the purpose of enabling their rich stockholders to grow still richer,

by loaning it out to those blood-suckers of the community—the city brokers and stock jobbers? Sir, they will be satisfied with no such thing. I warn you, Mr Chairman, that if this measure fails to pass—if we separate without making some distribution of the public money, the first question that will be put to you when you reach your district will be, 'Why didn't you pass the land bill?' And have you, sir, got your answer prepared? [Mr Mann nodded affirmatively.] I understand your intimation, I know, sir, that you can give as ingenious an answer to a difficult question as any man in this house or out of it. But I am mistaken if you do not find yourself puzzled to make a satisfactory one to this. I suppose you will reply to your constituent in the familiar language of the party, and say to him,—"You know, friend, this is one of Mr Clay's old plans for breaking down the Administration; you vote for Mr Van Buren, don't you?" "O yes," says the constituent, "I go for Mr Van Buren to be sure—he's the true democratic candidate; but then I don't see how passing the land bill could hurt him; Mr Clay's not going to run." "O but," says the representative, "you know Gen. Jackson is opposed to the bill, and that he would have vetoed it if we had passed it—you wouldn't have me go against General Jackson, would you?" "Well," answers the constituent, "I'm a Jackson man—to be sure; I always was a Jackson man—I mean ever since it came out in the Argus that General Jackson was taken into the democratic party; but I don't see why General Jackson should be opposed to this distribution—he used to be in favor of it. Don't you think Mr Van Buren could have persuaded him to sign the bill?" "I see," says the representative, "you don't understand this matter; this is one of the most outrageous measures that was ever presented to Congress, the very essence of it is bribery!" "Well," says the constituent, "I am opposed to bribery to be sure; I, and General Jackson, and the whole democratic party are opposed to all bribery, in the State Senate and every where else, but then I don't see how dividing the money among the People, giving to every one an equal share, can be bribery; when giving it to a few men in the cities, or letting the banks use it for nothing, is not. But I'll think of it. I go for the democratic party, to be sure; for the Benton yellow boys, and down with all monopolies; but I don't understand how this can be bribery after all—I must study a little more into this matter." Mr Chairman, I will not pursue this dialogue further. I will not suppose you would address your constituent in what has been alleged to be the secret language of party, and say to him that the use of the money was needed by the administration to increase the patronage, and secure the success of the party. I will not suppose this, because I know you to be incapable of either avowing or of acting upon any such motive. I wish I could say as much of every body else.

Sir, I have a few words to say in regard to the peculiar position of my own state, with reference to the expenditures of this Government, when I shall have done. I think I may safely say, that no State in the Union has shared so little in the direct pecuniary benefits of the General Government as Vermont. From the very beginning, she did not reap all the advantages conferred on the other States. Exercising throughout the whole of the Revolutionary War, an actual though unacknowledged independence, and occupying a frontier position, often the theatre of invasion, and always in imminent danger of it, her people have borne their full share in the perils, the trials, the expense and the honors of that contest. Yet she came into the Union in '77, bringing not with her a state debt to cast as a burden on the nation, but to unite with her sister states in the payment of the twenty millions of their debts which this Government had already assumed. Under the operation of the taxing power of this Government, she has paid her share of the debts of those States in proportion to her population and resources. I speak not this by way of complaint; I make the statement as a matter of fact and of history. Of the several hundred millions of the expenditures which this Government has made since its first organization under its present constitution, but a fraction has been disbursed in Vermont. I have not been able to ascertain, from printed public documents, the precise share which the State I in part represent has had in all our appropriations, but I will give you the amount for three permanent objects of local expenditure, as a sample. Your expenditures for fortifications have been \$17,526,000 dollars; for internal improvements, 6,283,000 dollars; and of neither of these sums has a dollar reached Vermont. Your expenditures for light houses have been 3,644,000 dollars, and of this Vermont has received the sum of 4,720 dollars and 22 cents. Sir, while other States can boast of the fortifications, the navy yards, the custom houses, the maritime hospitals, the mints, the armories, and other splendid works, which your treasury has caused to spring into existence; of the harbors and rivers whose channels you have deepened and enlarged; of roads and canals, which your munificence has constructed or aided, the only legible marks which you have made on the surface of Vermont, to which her people can point as evidence that she also belongs to the Union, is the light house I have mentioned, and a small arsenal—both together costing the Government something less than fifteen thousand dollars. I speak not even this in the way of complaining of the past expenditures of this Government or of putting in a claim for a large share in the future expenditures for similar objects. It is doubtless true that expenditures for national purposes should be made, where the general interest requires them, without reference to State lines; and I know that of the vast amount of future appropriations but a mere trifle can ever be expected to reach the State of which I am a representative. You have ceased making appropriations for internal improvements, and we can expect nothing for such objects. Our people are hardy and brave, and have always shown themselves well qualified to defend their territory, and require no fortifications; and having no seaboard, we are cut off from reaping any local benefits from the thousand maritime objects for which the greatest proportion of the funds of this government have been, and in all probability, will continue to be expended. Sir, the people of Vermont understand the consequences, which, under the practical legislation of this Government, are to follow

from their inland position; and they have been long looking forward to the period, when the national debt being discharged, and a surplus found in the Treasury, all objections to a distribution of the proceeds of the public lands would cease. The expected period has arrived, but the objections still continue, and we were warned by the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, in the opening of this debate, that there was not only to be no distribution, but that if the surplus continued, the compromise tariff act would not long be respected. Sir, I know this would be the natural consequence of the accumulation of an excess of revenue and a denial of its distribution; and being very sure that the extravagant expenditures which are proposed to be made in order to get rid of the surplus, cannot meet the deliberate approbation of the people, I believe the question will be between an abandonment of the tariff, and a distribution of the surplus among the States. Yes, sir, the measure of justice which you propose to deal out to the agriculturists, the manufacturers, and the mechanics of Vermont, is not only to deny them all advantages from the common fund arising out of the public lands, but to sacrifice the rewards of their industry to the cupidity of the capitalists, and the competition of the paupers of foreign Governments. Permit me to say, that this is a measure of justice, or rather of crying injustice, which they will not accept. And, sir, this position will not be a lonely one. The people of the whole country, and especially of the interior, perceiving that this measure of distribution is one which, in all its aspects, involves their highest and deepest interests, and that compared with it, their petty contests about who, for the time being, shall enjoy the honors and emoluments of office, dwindle into insignificance, will rise in their might, and breaking under the party shackles, which have bound them, will speak to their representatives a language in its favor which cannot be misunderstood, and which will not be resisted. But I will not dwell on this subject. I have already occupied more of the time of the committee than I intended, and I forbear to submit any further remarks.

NOTE.

The Public Lands were acquired by the United States by cessions from the old States, (the most important being that of Virginia in 1783,) and by the purchase of Louisiana in 1802, and Florida in 1819.—The quantity of land in the States and organized Territories, in which the Indian title still remains, is about seventy nine millions of acres. In two hundred and sixty eight millions the Indian title has become extinct, and of this one hundred and seventy six millions have been surveyed, forty four millions of it sold, and one hundred and thirty millions remains unsold. Besides this, there are, west of the Mississippi, and without the boundaries of the States and Territories, about seven hundred and fifteen millions of acres belonging to the United States, subject, however, to the Indian title.

The amount of the net proceeds of the sales of the public lands for the years 1833, '34 and '35, which the land bill proposes to distribute, is \$20,571,125 75. The amount of the sales for the first quarter of the present year exceeds 5 1-2 millions. Estimating the proceeds of 1836 at 5 1-2 millions, the amount to be distributed at the end of the present year will be about 36 millions. This sum, after deducting the ten per cent allowed to the new States, distributed among the States according to their federal population will give to each individual about \$275. The share of Vermont in this distribution, with a population of 220,655, would be \$771,800. If the State should make this a fund for the support of schools, it would at an interest of six per cent. produce the amount of \$47,308, equal to the sum that would be produced by a tax of 2 1-4 per cent on the whole grand list of the State. If the proceeds of the sales for 1837, which the land bill also provides for distributing, should equal those of the present year, the annual interest of the fund would considerably exceed the amount of the three cent tax annually assessed for the support of schools and enable the Legislature, if it thought proper, to dispense with its future collection.

If the Legislature should, under proper regulations, provide by law for enabling the several towns in the State to take charge of their respective shares of the fund, and distribute the same among them in proportion to their population, the sum of the present year may be readily calculated, by allowing \$2 75 for each individual. Thus, a town of one hundred inhabitants would receive 275 dollars; one of five hundred inhabitants, \$1,375; of one thousand, \$2,750; of fifteen hundred, \$4,125; of two thousand, \$5,500; of three thousand, \$8,250, &c. &c.

ORLEANS COUNTY CONVENTION.

Pursuant to the calls of the Anti-masonic and Whig County Committee, about fifty delegates of the freemen of the county of Orleans assembled at the Court House at Irasburgh, on Tuesday, the 14th of June, 1836, and organized by choosing

Dr. Lemuel Richmond, Chairman,
Jacob Bates, Esq., } Secretaries.
Dr. D. H. Bard, }

Resolved,—That a committee of three be appointed to report resolutions expressive of the sense of this Convention.

That a committee of two from each town represented, be raised to nominate a candidate for Senator for this county.

Messrs. J. Bates, A. Young, and S. Lyman were appointed to report resolutions.

The following gentlemen were appointed to nominate a candidate for Senator: Irasburgh, Geo. Nye, Thos. Jamieson; Brownington, E. Strong, A. Stewart; Coventry, Argulus Hammon, F. Flanders; Salem, N. Hopkinson; Charleston, J. M. Robinson, E. Cole; Greensboro', S. Hill, S. M. Scott; Troy, N. Perkins, Dr. Bard; Craftsbury, Col. Simmon, J. A. Padlock; Derby, Col. Carpenter, S. Stewart; Mor-

gan, Ira Leavins, Jonathan Cummings; Newport, Charles S. us.

After a short recess, the committee to nominate a candidate for Senator, made their report; and, in accordance therewith, it was—

Resolved, That Hon. Augustus Young be recommended to the freemen of this county as a candidate for the office of Senator.

The committee on resolutions reported; and, after discussion and amendment, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the present situation of political affairs throughout the United States, demands of every freeman and patriot his utmost exertion to place in the Presidential Chair one whose talents and integrity will carry into effect the spirit of the Constitution, and maintain the supremacy of the laws.

Resolved, That we approve of the nomination of William Henry Harrison for President of the United States, by the spontaneous action of several of the States, and by vast numbers of republican conventions throughout the country, because he has ever proved the pure patriot, the honest and enlightened statesman, the virtuous citizen, and the gallant and judicious soldier.

Resolved, That we disapprove of the nomination of Martin Van Buren, the man who stands wholly uncommitted, except in his late casting vote in the Senate, and that he will, if elected, follow generally in the footsteps of Gen. Jackson; and because we believe him destitute of the requisite qualifications for administering the government of freemen that are justly awarded to William Henry Harrison.

Resolved, That we approve of the nomination of Francis Granger for the office of Vice President, because he has ever manifested an inflexible adherence to virtuous principles—a steady regard for the best good of his country—the possession of talents of a high order, and has ever faithfully and efficiently discharged the duties of the important stations which he has been called to occupy.

Resolved, That we are opposed to the nomination of Richard M. Johnson, because we believe his practical disregard of the laws of civil and christian society, in respect to the domestic relations, render it highly unsuitable and dangerous to raise him to an exalted station, where his example might contaminate many, and his principles teach others to disregard all distinctions between virtue and vice.

Resolved, That the political principles of the Anti-masonic party in Vermont, as promulgated in the public addresses and resolutions of its various conventions, are in accordance with the pure principles of republicanism; and, when rationally considered, are of a conservative tendency, and deservedly dear to the friends of the best interests of the country.

Resolved, That we view with abhorrence the attempts now making in the Congress of the United States, to invade the sacred right of the freedom of the press, guaranteed by the constitution, by establishing a detestable espionage in the Post Office department, under the pretence of suppressing the circulation of incendiary publications; and that any northern man who can vote for and sustain such a measure is morally unfitted to discharge any office in a republican government.

Resolved, That we approve of the Bill usually called Mr. Clay's Land Bill, providing for a distribution of the Surplus Revenue of the United States.

Resolved, That we approve of the nominations made for State officers by the Anti-masonic and Whig Conventions held at Montpelier, in February last; and that we will use all honorable means to insure the election of the candidates nominated.

Resolved, That the late discovery of Martin Van Buren's Anti-masonry ought to be classed with the recently made discovery of bipeds in the moon.

Voted, That a committee of one for the county and one in each town, be appointed for the purpose of disseminating information in regard to the coming election.

Geo. Nye, Esq. was appointed for the county; for Derby, Col. Carpenter; Salem, N. Hopkinson; Charleston, J. M. Robinson; Brownington, E. G. Strong; Coventry, A. M. Smith; Irasburgh, Geo. Worthington; Jer. Barton, John Kimball; Glover, — Simon; Greensboro', J. M. Scott; Craftsbury, Asa Hoyt; Lowell, Albert Curtis; Westfield, H. Richardson; Troy, Dr. Bard; Jay, O. Emerson; Newport, Chas. Sias; Albany, Winthrop Howard; Eden, Wm. H. Innes; Morrisstown, Saml. A. Willard; Hydepark, Wm. P. Sawyer; Wolcott, N. Jones; Holland, Ezra Humen; Morgan, John Bartlett.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this Convention be signed by the Chairman and Secretaries, and published in the newspapers friendly to our cause, whose editors may be disposed to insert them.

The Convention then adjourned.

LEMUEL RICHMOND, Chairman,
JACOB BATES,
D. H. BARD, Secretaries.